Vindiciæ Dominicæ:

A

DEFENCE

OF THE

REFORMATION-STANDARDS

OF THE

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND,

CONCERNING THE

ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER;

AND THE

ONE SONSHIP OF JESUS CHRIST:

IN WHICH

Some DOCTRINES of the ſaid Standards, upon theſe important Subjects, are EXPLAINED and VINDICATED.

Amici Patres, amici Fratres; ſed magis amica Veritas.

EDINBURGH:
Printed by MURRAY & COCHRAN.
Sold by W. GRAY, Front of the Exchange;
and other Bookſellers. 1778.
[Price Sixpence.]

BRITISH MUSEUM

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE Author of the following DEFENCE is ſo far from a fondneſs of appearing in Print, that, though he has made ſeveral other Publications in the courſe of above thirty-ſix years bygone, — he never made any in an ultroneous manner, or of mere Choice; but always under ſome Providential Neceſſity: which is alſo the preſent caſe. And, from a regard to the Peace of the Church, he never could allow himſelf to raiſe a new Debate, — or to deal in ſuch when raiſed; ſo long as he could ſee, that forbearance might conſiſt with what he owes to the Truth.

The Occaſion given for the *Second Part* of this Defence, will be ſomewhat explained afterwards. —— With regard to the *Firſt Part*, he could give ſuch a Hiſtory as might ſufficiently account for the Neceſſity of his preſent Appearance: While ſome very diſtinguiſhed and contemptuous Provocation ſeveral years ago, could not prevail with him to be the firſt in Print upon this Subject. But there are many, who already underſtand ſomething of this Matter:

Matter: and it doth not ſeem to be of any Advantage, that others alſo ſhould be informed; or that any Memorial of what he means — ſhould be tranſmitted to Poſterity.

It ſhall only be farther obſerved, on this Subject, — that even when a Performance, beſide the manifeſt Futility and well-known Spitefulneſs of it, is ſo contemptibly ſophiſtical and pedantic, that one may juſtly ſcorn to take particular Notice of it; there may yet be a Neceſſity of having the Truth explained and vindicated, in oppoſition to the groſs and dangerous Miſrepreſentations which it labours to impoſe upon the common Reader, — though not in the way of honouring it with a formal Anſwer: And the Diſcharge of this Duty is now intended, by

ADAM GIB.

EDINBURGH,
Dec. 15.
1778.

P. 18, l. 18; *after* terms *read* of
P. 43, l. 7 *from the foot*; *read* adding.

VINDICIÆ DOMINICÆ.

PART I.

A *Defence* of the Doctrine of our Standards, concerning the *Adminiſtration* of the LORD's *Supper*.

SECTION I.

This Doctrine explained.

I. THE *Doctrine* of our Standards which is now referred to, concerning the Adminiſtration of the Lord's Supper, lies in the following paſſages, *viz.*

The SHORTER CATECHISM.

" Queſt. 96. *What is the Lord's Supper?*"
" *Anſw.* The Lord's Supper is a Sacrament;
" wherein, by giving and receiving Bread and
" Wine according to Chriſt's appointment, his
" Death is ſhewed forth," &c.

The LARGER CATECHISM.

" Queſt. 168. *What is the Lord's Supper?*"
" *Anſw.* The Lord's Supper is a Sacrament of
" the New Teſtament; wherein, by giving and
" receiving

" receiving Bread and Wine according to the ap-
" pointment of Jeſus Chriſt, his Death is ſhewed
" forth," &c.

" Queſt. 169. *How hath Chriſt appointed*
" *Bread and Wine to be given and received,*
" *in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper?*"

" *Anſw.* Chriſt hath appointed the Miniſters of
" his Word, in the Adminiſtration of this Sacra-
" ment of the Lord's Supper, to ſet apart the
" Bread and Wine from common uſe by the words
" of Inſtitution, Thankſgiving and Prayer; and to
" take and break the Bread, and to give both the
" Bread and the Wine to the Communicants: who
" are, by the ſame appointment, to take and eat
" the Bread, and to drink the Wine; in thankful
" Remembrance that the Body of Chriſt was bro-
" ken and given, and his Blood ſhed for them."

The CONFESSION OF FAITH, chap. xxix.

" I. Our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, in the Night where-
" in he was betrayed, inſtituted the Sacrament of
" his Body and Blood, commonly called the Lord's
" Supper, to be obſerved in his Church to the
" End of the World; for the perpetual Remem-
" brance of the Sacrifice of himſelf in his Death."

" II. —— Only a Commemoration of that One
" Offering up of himſelf by himſelf, upon the
" Croſs, once for all; and a Spiritual Oblation of
" all poſſible praiſe unto God for the ſame."

" III. The Lord Jeſus hath, in this Ordinance,

" appointed

" appointed his Miniſters to declare his Word of " Inſtitution to the People, to pray and bleſs the " Elements of Bread and Wine, and thereby to " ſet them apart from a common to an holy uſe; " and to take and break the Bread, to take the " Cup, and (they alſo communicating) to give both " to the Communicants."

The DIRECTORY FOR THE PUBLIC WORSHIP OF GOD.

" *Of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.*"

" The Table, being before decently covered, " and ſo conveniently placed that the Communi- " cants may orderly ſit about it or at it; the Mi- " niſter is to begin the Action with ſanctifying and " bleſſing the Elements of Bread and Wine ſet be- " fore him: The Bread in comely and convenient " Veſſels, ſo prepared, that being taken by him " and given, it may be diſtributed among the Com- " municants; the Wine alſo in large Cups: Ha- " ving firſt, in a few Words, ſhewed that theſe " Elements, otherwiſe common, are now ſet apart " and ſanctified to this holy uſe; by the Word of " Inſtitution and Prayer. Let the words of In- " ſtitution be read out of the Evangeliſts, or out " of the Firſt Epiſtle of the Apoſtle *Paul* to the " *Corinthians.*"

" The Elements being now ſanctified by the " Word and Prayer, the Miniſter, being at the

" Table, is to take the Bread in his Hand; and " ſay, in theſe expreſſions (or other the like, uſed " by Chriſt or his Apoſtles upon this occaſion): " [According to the Holy Inſtitution, Command, " and Example, of our bleſſed Saviour Jeſus " Chriſt, I take this Bread, and, having given " Thanks, I break it, and give it unto you, (Here " the Miniſter, who is alſo himſelf to communi- " cate, is to break the Bread and give it to the " Communicants): *Take ye, eat ye*; *This is the* " *Body of Chriſt which is broken for you*; *Do* " *this in remembrance of him*]."

" In like manner the Miniſter is to take the " Cup; and ſay, in theſe Expreſſions (or other " the like, uſed by Chriſt or the Apoſtles upon the " ſame occaſion): [According to the Inſtitution, " Command, and Example of our Lord Jeſus " Chriſt, I take this Cup and give it unto you, " (Here he giveth it to the Communicants): *This* " *Cup is the New Teſtament in the Blood of* " *Chriſt, which is ſhed for the Remiſſion of the* " *Sins of many*; *Drink ye all of it*]."

II. For illuſtrating the above Doctrine, it may be remarked, that, —

1. Our Standards, in this matter, evidently reſpect the Caſe of a Miniſter diſpenſing the Lord's Supper to his Congregation; without any Brethren aſſiſting him in that Work. And they could not juſtly do otherwiſe, when properly converſant about

about the *Nature* of the Adminiſtration: For no neceſſity of Aſſiſtants could be ſuppoſed to lie in the *Stated Nature*, however much in the *Occaſional Conveniency* of it. —— Where this is the Caſe, the Miniſter muſt neceſſarily be ſuppoſed "at the Table—alſo himſelf to communicate;" as he proceeds to give the Elements to his People: which yet there can be no neceſſity of, when he may receive them from the hand of an aſſiſting Brother. It is determined, that the Miniſter muſt "alſo communicate;" and his doing ſo in either of theſe ways, is the ſame thing upon the matter: while it muſt be, not only a monſtrous impropriety of Conduct, but alſo a ſhocking indignity done to the Ordinance; if a Miniſter, when diſpenſing it to others, or aſſiſting a Brother in the Work,—ſhould decline to partake with them on that occaſion.

2. As our Standards plainly acknowledge only "Bread and Wine" for Sacramental *Elements*, they as plainly acknowledge only "giving and re-"ceiving" for Sacramental *Actions*; according to the peculiar ſenſe of being ſuch,—that is, Actions ſymbolical, or myſtically ſignificant. No other ſenſe can be put upon the general view given of that Holy Ordinance, in our *Shorter* and *Larger Catechiſms*.

3. According to our Standards, the Sacrament of our Lord's Supper is "for the perpetual *Re-*"*membrance* of the Sacrifice of himſelf in his

" Death, — a *Commemoration* of that One Offer-
" ing up of himſelf by himſelf, upon the Croſs,
" once for all." And while this excludes the Po-
piſh Sacrifice of the Maſs (as they call it), in which
Chriſt is ſtill pretended to be offered up as an un-
bloody Sacrifice for remiſſion of Sins of the quick
and dead; it likewiſe excludes all idea of *acting*,
or making a tragical repreſentation of the *crucifying* of Chriſt: For not the *crucifixion*, but
Chriſt crucified, is properly exhibited in that Sa-
crament.

4. According to our Standards, " the Miniſter
" is to begin the Action with ſanctifying and bleſſ-
" ing the Elements of Bread and Wine ſet before
" him." This is the *firſt* ſtep to be taken by
him in the Adminiſtration: After which he is " to
" take and break the Bread, to take the Cup, and
" to give both to the Communicants."

5. According to our Standards, the " ſanctify-
" ing and bleſſing the Elements of Bread and
" Wine" is " by the Word of Inſtitution and
" Prayer;" by theſe, not ſeparately but con-
junctly. " The Lord Jeſus hath, in this Ordi-
" nance, appointed his Miniſters to declare his
" Word of Inſtitution to the People;" which may
" be read out of the Evangeliſts, or out of the
" Firſt Epiſtle of the Apoſtle *Paul* to the *Corin-
" thians:*" and then immediately, he is " to
" pray, and bleſs the Elements of Bread and Wine;
" and thereby ſet them apart to this holy uſe."

The

The declaring of the Word of Inſtitution, does not properly *ſet them apart*; it only ſets forth the Divine warrant, in general, for repeated celebrations of this Ordinance: and by Prayer this general warrant is applied to the preſent caſe, to the caſe of the Elements now ſet before the Miniſter; as ſetting theſe apart to the holy uſe. Therefore no religious Action about theſe Elements can properly intervene, or come betwixt declaring the Word of Inſtitution and Prayer,—or in the time of either; as it is not till the declaring of the Word of Inſtitution be ſucceeded by Prayer, that theſe Elements come to be of any religious conſideration. And ſo,

6. According to our Standards, it is "by the "Word of Inſtitution and Prayer," not by any one of theſe but by both of them,—that the Bread and Wine are "ſet apart from *common* "uſe; from a *common* to an holy uſe; theſe E- "lements, otherwiſe *common*, are now ſet apart "and ſanctified to this holy uſe." Theſe Elements do therefore continue to be of a *common* uſe, till after both the Word of Inſtitution and Prayer; ſo that it is not till after both, not one but both, that any holy or religious uſe of them, or Action concerning them, can take place. Therefore,

7. According to our Standards, the Miniſter is to have but *one taking* of the Bread and Wine. ——Having theſe ſet conveniently before him, and

and under his eye, as the particular Elements which he is going to ſet apart for an holy uſe; he is immediately to do ſo, by reading the Words of Inſtitution and Prayer: So that he is to have no taking or touching of the Elements, either before or betwixt, or in the time of, any of theſe two exerciſes of conſecrating the ſame. Thus, there is no allowance for a *firſt* taking up of the Bread and Cup *before* Prayer, — in order to a ſetting them down again upon the Table till *after* Prayer; and then taking them up a *ſecond* time, ſo as to break the Bread (the Wine being already poured out into Cups), — in order to a giving of the broken Bread and Cup to the Communicants: But this laſt is the *only* allowed taking in the whole Adminiſtration; the Miniſter is to have no taking of the Elements for any other diſpoſal of them, — no Taking, but that which is for an immediate Breaking and Giving.

III. The Remarks which have been now made, do natively introduce the following Obſervations.

1. That the Doctrine of our Standards, concerning the Adminiſtration of the Lord's Supper, doth really ſtand as above repreſented, — is a moſt unqueſtionable matter of fact; which cannot be controverted, but by ſuch unreaſonableneſs as might equally ſerve for controverting any thing. And therefore, when a Miniſter is diſpenſing that Holy Ordinance, he either confines himſelf to the *One Taking* which has been explained; or he is walking

walking contrary to our Standards upon this head, in his method of Adminiſtration.

It would be a pitiful Evaſion in this caſe, a Reproach upon an ordinary Underſtanding and honeſt Conſcience; to ſtate a Compariſon betwixt the Paſſages of our Standards which have been quoted, and ſome merely *prudential* Regulations in our *Directory* for Public Worſhip: As if one might as warrantably depart from the Rule of the ſaid Paſſages, as from any of theſe Regulations; for inſtance, that of beginning public Worſhip with *Prayer*. For various Regulations in our Directory, as that now mentioned, are about matters of a merely circumſtantial and indifferent nature, —which could not, conſiſtently with their nature, be impoſed as of a permanent expediency; while Chriſtian prudence, through ſome courſe of Experience, may take ſuch things in another view than it had formerly done. And accordingly, our Directory doth ſeveral times make an expreſs reference of matters to a Miniſter's wiſdom and diſcretion; while this muſt always be underſtood, though not expreſſed, about all things of ſuch a nature as hath been mentioned: The Directory having been expreſsly deſigned for a middle way,—betwixt all want of common Order, and an Epiſcopal impoſition of ſet Forms. —— But the foreſaid Paſſages are of a very different conſideration, as properly belonging to the *doctrinal* part of our Standards: which cannot be of an ambulatory nature, or ſubject to any variation by providential circum-

circumſtances or human prudence; but muſt continue the ſame in every period, as much as the Solemn Ordinance of the Supper is ever the ſame. If we might uſe ſuch freedoms with our received Doctrine, as with indifferent circumſtances of common order; the truth of the Goſpel muſt periſh. The Regulations in our Directory about ſuch circumſtances, are only laid down as what the Compilers judged to be then expedient: But the order preſcribed by our Standards, for being obſerved in the Adminiſtration of the Lord's Supper, is expreſsly taught to be what CHRIST HATH APPOINTED.

2. The peculiar reſpect which is due to our Standards, ought to be properly conſidered. —— They were compiled, received, and ratified, by ſome of the moſt Venerable Synods which ever met ſince the days of the Apoſtles; and that, as a principal Fruit and Fulfilment of Solemn Engagements to the Lord, — for a ſcriptural Uniformity in the Churches of *Britain* and *Ireland*. They have been avouched and eſtabliſhed in the Church of *Scotland*, as her Teſts of Orthodoxy and ſoundneſs in the Faith. An adherence to them has been often ſealed by the Blood of Martyrs. Young men at receiving Licence, and Miniſters at Ordination, — have been long obliged to profeſs a full approbation of them; and have accordingly come under the ſtrongeſt Engagements, for maintaining and obſerving them. Yea many among us, of late years, Miniſters and People, have avouched

avouched the ſame Approbation and Engagements by the Oath of God; in the Renovation of our Solemn Covenants.

3. Theſe Standards were not haſty, looſe, or raw productions; but were moſt deliberately, accurately, and maturely digeſted, — under a manifeſt guidance of the Holy Ghoſt. Such as are acquainted with religious controverſies, will readily perceive, — that every article of them is purpoſely laid, in a proper oppoſition to Errors and Corruptions which had infeſted the Church: And this will be afterwards made to appear, with regard to the Paſſages which have been quoted. —— When the Compilers determined againſt any Taking up of the Elements by the Miniſter till *after* Prayer, they knew well enough that our Lord took Bread *before* Prayer: yet they had good reaſon, as will ſoon be evidenced, not only for not allowing, — but for excluding a pretended Imitation of our Lord's Example, in that matter.

4. Theſe Standards are not pretended to be infallible; or of any account but in ſubordination to the Holy Scriptures, as the only infallible Rule of Faith and Manners: And an inſufferable Reproach is caſt upon ſuch as are for maintaining them in the preſent caſe; when it is pretended that "we ſurely muſt offer very great injury to "them," as if "we would propoſe to put them "upon a level with the Scriptures."

According to our *Confeſſion of Faith*, — "all

" Synods and Councils, ſince the Apoſtles times, " whether general or particular, may err; and " *many* have erred:" But this muſt infer, that *all* have not erred. The Compilers, and firſt Receivers of our Standards, were confident that they had not erred in them; all the Avouchers of them, ſince that time, have been confident of the ſame thing: and, though they were not infallible, but *might* err, — their *actual erring* ought not to be alledged, without ſolid proof. For,

5. Our Standards are not lightly to be contradicted or departed from; eſpecially by ſuch as have come under ſolemn Vows for maintaining and obſerving them. We would need to have ſome very ſuſtantial and plain Reaſon for our Conduct, when venturing to do ſo. A flimſy Harangue, or a looſe and ſuperficial Deſcant, upon ſome Appearance of contrariety to the terms *Scripture-Inſtitution* in the caſe before us, — will not be ſufficient for overturning them; or for ſalving the Conſcience in an attempt of that ſort, though palliated by ſome dry compliments put upon them. —— And all the countenance for this which can be pretended, from the Practice of even the beſt of Men, muſt go for nothing; ſo far as not ſupported by any ſolid Reaſon, but only by the weight of their Characters, — which can never authoriſe the inconſiderateneſs or impropriety to which even the beſt are liable.

To tell concerning our Standards, — that " it " may

" may not be improper to conſider them as be-
" ing rather, in their deſign, doctrinally ſetting
" forth the truth of things in an abridged way;
" than reſtricting and limiting unto that particu-
" lar order which is mentioned or preſented by
" them;"—and that "to mention Prayer firſt
" of the four Actions, may be to point out, that
" this is the main or chief Action; wherein is
" ſolemnly and eſpecially the Conſecration:" Theſe are nothing better, than diſingenuous and trifling ways of contradicting and defaming our ſworn-to and valuable Standards.

SECT. II.

This Doctrine vindicated.

I. The Matter eſpecially in queſtion, is,—the *Taking* of the Elements, by the Miniſter, in his diſpenſing the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper: whether he is to take them, particularly the Bread, only *after* ſetting them apart by Prayer; or if he is alſo to take them *before* Prayer;—taking them a *firſt* time, as Elements which he is going to conſecrate, for an immediate ſetting of them down again; and taking them a *ſecond* time, as Elements which he has conſecrated, for an immediate diſtribution of them to the Communicants? But before diſcuſſing this Queſtion, ſeveral things are

to be conſidered, — for preventing or removing miſtakes, concerning the proper ſtate thereof.

1. It is not refuſed, — that the original Inſtitution of the Sacramental Supper, as recorded by the Evangeliſts and the Apoſtle *Paul*, is the ſupreme Standard to which our Adminiſtration of the Ordinance ſhould be conformed; and that ſubordinate Standards are to be reckoned of no authority, but ſo far as derived from and agreeing with the Sacred Original. The only Queſtion here will be, — What was of an *Occaſional* and what was of a *Standing* nature, in our Lord's Example and Inſtitution?

2. It is not refuſed, — that our Lord *took* the Bread *before* bleſſing or giving Thanks; this being a matter quite indiſputable, according to the Scriptural Record of his Practice on that occaſion *. And it is moſt unaccountable, that ſuch as adhere to our Standards, in the preſent Controverſy, ſhould have been ſuſpected of contradicting this plain fact, — by a ridiculous Criticiſm upon the original Language: A moſt imaginary ſuſpicion, — which could ſerve no better purpoſe than to make way for getting common People amuſed, by a parade of deep learning; in taking

* It is of no conſequence here, to debate the Queſtion; Whether our Lord's Taking of the Cup was at the ſame time, before the ſame giving of Thanks, — or if this Taking was before a ſecond giving of Thanks?

occaſion

occaſion from it to foiſt in a deal of impertinence about *Greek Aoriſts*, — with *Syriac*, and *French*, and *Dutch* Tranſlations.

3. It is not refuſed, — that the Taking of the Bread is a *Sacramental* Action, according to the *general* ſenſe of that word; as meaning what belongs, and neceſſarily belongs, to the Adminiſtration of the Sacrament. It is only refuſed to be ſo, in the *peculiar* ſenſe of the word; as meaning a myſtical or ſignificant Sign and Seal of a ſpiritual Benefit, by poſitive Inſtitution, to the Faith of Communicants.

4. It is not pretended, — that the *Taking* of the Bread is merely neceſſary in order to the *Giving*; as is imagined by Papiſts and Lutherans. But it is acknowledged to be of indiſpenſable neceſſity, alſo, in order to the *Breaking*. For it is not ſimply the Bread, but the Bread *as broken*, which is the Sacramental Sign; and therefore the Breaking doth neceſſarily belong to the conſtituting of that Sign, — as it neceſſarily ſuppoſes the Taking.

5. It is not pretended, — that the practice of any individuals, in taking *before* as well as *after* Prayer, ſhould be treated as a matter of ſcandal or offence in the Church; according to an abſolute conſidering of the thing. There always has been, and ever will be, in the Church-militant, — a variety of apprehenſions, and miſapprehenſions, about Things indifferent or circumſtantial. It is natural,

natural, even to go to an extreme in imitating the Objects of our Veneration, as to Circumſtances of Behaviour: Nor could this ever be ſo excuſeable with regard to any other, as the glorious Author of that Ordinance now treated of. And Chriſtians ſhould bear with one another in many caſes of Miſtake, when they are not improved to any miſchief; or when there is no harm in them, any way comparable with that of diſturbing the Peace of the Church by attempting to correct them. While things indifferent, though improper, are left indifferent, — they ſhould much rather be borne with.

But when the *firſt* Taking, now ſpoken of, is turned into a matter of impoſition upon the Conſciences of others, — as a neceſſary and ſubſtantial part of the Ordinance, yea as a foundation of new Doctrines concerning it; with a poſitive impugning of our Standards, upon that ſubject; — and when people are in hazard of being diſtracted and confounded, if not actually ſeduced, by a proſecuting of ſuch Meaſures: It is certainly high time, for withſtanding the progreſs of that evil. But the introducing a neceſſity of this, may well be conſidered as a matter of heavy Blame.

II. The Way is now paved, for proceeding to a Vindication of our Reformation-Standards; upon the head of their *ſhutting the Door* againſt any but *one Taking* of the Elements by a Miniſter, at his

his diſpenſing the Sacrament of our Lord's Supper, — and that only *after* ſanctifying them by the Word of Inſtitution and Prayer, for diſtributing them to the Communicants. And this may be done, under the following *Propoſitions*.

1. Our Standards, concerning the Adminiſtration of the Lord's Supper, — are properly laid, for maintaining only what is of a *Standing* Nature in the Inſtitution of that Ordinance.

2. They are properly laid, for confining the *ſymbolical* ſtate of that Ordinance to the line of Divine Inſtitution.

3. They are laid, in a proper and neceſſary oppoſition to the Idolatrous Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*.

4. They are laid, in a proper and neceſſary oppoſition to the Superſtitious Corruptions of the Epiſcopal Church of *England*.

5. They are properly laid, for excluding Superſtition about the *remaining part* of the Elements.

6. They are properly laid, for obviating *human inventions*, in the Method of Adminiſtration.

7. They are properly laid, for maintaining the Sacramental *Unity* of that Holy Ordinance.

It now remains, that theſe *Propoſitions* be ſeverally eſtabliſhed.

PRO-

PROPOSITION I.

Our Standards, concerning the Adminiſtration of the Lord's Supper, — are properly laid, for maintaining only what is of a *Standing* Nature in the Inſtitution of that Ordinance.

NONE will deny, — that ſeveral things which are recorded, concerning the firſt Celebration of this Sacrament, were wholly of an *Occaſional* Nature; not proper Parts of the Ordinance. —— That Celebration was *at Night*; and it was in a *large upper Room*, by our Lord's expreſs Direction; and it was *after Supper*; and the Communicants were all placed together *at once*, about one Table; and they communicated in a *Leaning* poſture, as one of them was then leaning on the Boſom of Jeſus: and, from the circumſtance of the Time, being the time of the Paſſover; it muſt have been *unleavened* Bread which was then uſed. But though the diſpenſing of this Ordinance by *Paul* at *Troas* [Acts xx. 7. 8. 11.] was at Night, and in an upper Chamber; and though an obſervance of it after Supper, appears [1 Cor. xi. 21.] to have been the uſage of the Church of *Corinth*; and though, according to ancient Church-hiſtory, it was ordinarily at Night or in the Evening, for above

above 200 years after *; and though there was a long and ſharp contending for continuing the uſe of unleavened Bread, by the *Latin* againſt the *Greek* Churches *: —yet all theſe are juſtly allowed to paſs among us, as only *Occaſional* Circumſtances; without offering to plead upon our Lord's Example, for continuing all or any of them in the Sacramental Supper.

And as little Reaſon is there for pleading upon his Example, in behalf of that *Taking* of the Bread which is now under conſideration. The Evangeliſts and the Apoſtle *Paul* record the fact as it occaſionally ſtood, (juſt as *Moſes* recorded the fact of the Paſſover-inſtitution); that Jeſus *took Bread*, and *gave Thanks* or *bleſſed* it: all of them recording equally, that this was at *Night*. While the Apoſtle, at coming to ſet forth the Sacramental Supper as a Standing Ordinance in the Church, — ſaw meet to do ſo, not in a doctrinal manner, but by a narration of our Lord's Behaviour at the Inſtitution; he could not juſtly make that Narration, any other ways than as the caſe really was: And this he did, without any diſtinguiſhing betwixt what was of an Occaſional and what was of a Standing Nature in that caſe; juſt as *Moſes* made no ſuch diſtinction, in his account of the Inſtitution of the Paſſover. Yet none will queſtion, that ſome things in his account were

* *Pareus*, in 1 Cor. xi.

only of an Occaſional Nature; and were obviouſly to be judged of as ſuch, from the peculiar circumſtances of the firſt legal Paſſover. Nor was it leſs obvious, what was to be judged of as ſuch in the Apoſtle's narrative; from the peculiar circumſtances of the firſt Goſpel-Paſſover, and the nature of the Ordinance itſelf: while the Taking, as *before* giving Thanks, could not but appear Occaſional,—as much as the *Night*-ſeaſon of the Celebration, which he alſo records. The Taking *before* bleſſing ought therefore to be conſidered as an *Occaſional* circumſtance of the firſt Celebration, or perhaps of ſome after Celebrations, alſo among Chriſtian *Jews*; as much as the People eating with their loins girded and their ſtaff in their hand, though by expreſs Divine Appointment,—was only an Occaſional Circumſtance of the firſt Paſſover.

It is certain, that the Compilers of our Standards took this to be the caſe; when they not only did not include,—but plainly *excluded* that Taking before Prayer, from being conſidered as a Standing part of the Ordinance. And there is good Reaſon for doing ſo. As,

1. While it was a matter of ordinary practice among the Jews, in the ſocial uſe of their daily Bread,—that the Maſter of a Family, or ſome other Perſon employed, did begin with bleſſing or giving Thanks; it was of as ordinary practice, that he did ſo with a piece of Bread in his Hand,

The

The truth of this, if diſputed, can eaſily be inſtructed from writers on the Jewiſh Antiquities: But we need no further Evidence of it than what lies in the New Teſtament; as will be obſerved in a little. It is an idle fancy,—that ſuch was the caſe only at "ſome peculiar Entertainment, where "Gueſts were entertained;" or that herein "ſome "diſtinguiſhing Office was exerciſed, for diſtin-"guiſhing it from the more common and ordi-"nary taking of food:" And though this had been the caſe, it could avail nothing in the preſent Controverſy; for ſtill it muſt remain a matter of *Civil Uſage*, as diſtinguiſhed from that which is Eccleſiaſtical.

This Jewiſh cuſtom, as having nothing blameable in it, our Lord complied with. Beſide his doing ſo, on two occaſions of miraculouſly feeding Multitudes; he likewiſe did ſo, in the caſe of entering upon an ordinary Entertainment with two Diſciples at *Emmaus:* Which laſt is ridiculouſly imagined by ſome, to have been a diſpenſing of the Sacramental Supper; an imagination which would give more countenance than has ever been pretended,—to the Popiſh corruption of communicating in one kind only, or without the uſe of the Cup. The Apoſtle *Paul* likewiſe uſed the ſame cuſtom [Acts xxvii. 35.], at his partaking of an ordinary Entertainment with a Company of Heathen Soldiers and Sailors in his voyage to *Rome*.—And when our Lord complied with

that Cuſtom, he gave a proper Example for avoiding Singularity in things indifferent and inoffenſive. But are we to imagine, that, in doing ſo at his entering on the Inſtitution of the Sacramental Supper, he alſo intended thereby to tranſfer a mere indifferent Jewiſh Uſage to all other Nations, — by making it a proper part of this Ordinance?

2. The *Acts of the Apoſtles* give ſome account of ſeveral Celebrations of the Lord's Supper, after the firſt: And as the *Breaking of Bread* was a moſt material part of the Ordinance, it was denominated from this, — mentioning it as a part for the whole, *Acts* ii. 42, 46. and xx. 7, 11. But there is not one ſyllable through all the New Teſtament, in the caſe of any after Celebration, about Taking *before* Bleſſing; nor has one ſyllable been found concerning it in the courſe of Church-Hiſtory, as to the practice of the Church in following Ages: There appears to have been as dead a ſilence all along upon this ſubject, — as there was about girding the loins and a ſtaff in the hand, at all Celebrations of the Old-Teſtament Paſſover after the firſt. And whatever differences of practice have more lately taken place, or whatever inconſiderate Explications have been made by any in the Doctrine of the Sacrament: No public managing of a Plea, in behalf of that firſt Taking as a Standing Part of the Ordinance, ſeems ever to have exiſted on the face of the Earth; till done

by

by a Pamphlet which was printed in the year 1776, though not ventured abroad till two years afterwards.

3. The *Taking* now ſpoken of, conſidered as *before* the Bleſſing, was by no means a *Sacramental* Action in the *peculiar* ſenſe of the word; as denoting a ſymbolical Sign and Seal. This is abſolutely certain, from our Lord's not uttering a word for putting any ſpiritual ſignification upon it to the Faith of his Diſciples. When they ſaw him take the Bread, as not in the beginning of an Entertainment, but at the cloſe of the Paſſover-Supper; they could not but be immediately ſtruck with an apprehenſion of his ſetting about ſomething extraordinary: yet that Action itſelf, while juſt ſuch as they had been uſed to ſee, was not ſet forth to them as any way of an extraordinary or Sacramental Nature.

4. This *Taking*, conſidered as before the Bleſſing, was by no means a *Sacramental* Action in the *general* ſenſe of the word; as denoting an Action of natural neceſſity, though not of myſtical ſignification, in the Sacramental Ordinance. The *Breaking* is an Action of this Nature; and the *Taking*, as in order to an immediate Breaking and Giving, is ſo likewiſe. But the *Taking*, as *before* Bleſſing, can be of no neceſſity for this purpoſe; yea has not even any relation to it, or connection with it: while, as the Breaking is not till after the Bleſſing; it is only the Taking after the Bleſſing,

Bleſſing, which properly ſerves for the immediate Breaking and Giving. And ſo far as our Lord's Taking before Bleſſing did ſerve for diſtinguiſhing what he was about to bleſs, from any other Food then upon the Table; this purpoſe is fully ſerved, by having nothing elſe ſet before the Miniſter.—— Thus, in no ſenſe of the word can the Taking *before* Bleſſing be reckoned a Sacramental Action; but only an Occaſional Circumſtance of the firſt Inſtitution. And what ſhould one think, or how ſhall he reſtrain his indignation; at finding many pages employed in fabulous Doctrine about a neceſſity and importance of the *firſt* taking in order to a laying down, which is but an imaginary part of the Ordinance: yet at the ſame time to find the *other* taking in order to a breaking and giving, which is a moſt real part of the Ordinance, paſſed over with abſolute diſregard; as if it did not deſerve the ſmalleſt notice, not even in one ſentence? This conduct cannot be ſo much imputed to mere miſtake, as to a power of the Spirit of Error.

5. Our Lord cannot be ſuppoſed to have intended his *Taking*, as before *Bleſſing*, for a Sacramental Action, in which his Example was to be *imitated* through following ages; becauſe he well knew, that a continued imitation of it would be *impoſſible*. If his Example in this matter were to be imitated by his followers, it would behove them to imitate the ſame fairly and honeſtly, juſt as

as it ſtands; without cutting and carving upon it: as an arbitrary and partial dealing in the matter would be a corrupting of his Example, by ſubſtituting an unjuſt Reſemblance in its place.—— Now, it is abſolutely certain, that our Lord took up at once the *whole* of the Bread which was to be uſed in the new Ordinance; as could eaſily be done, when there were ſo few Communicants: For he had no repeated Actions of Taking, Breaking, and Giving. Nor is it leſs certain, that he *held* the Bread *in his Hand* during all the time in which he bleſſed it; or till he brake it: There can be no queſtioning of this, without doing groſs violence to the ſcriptural account of his Behaviour; perverting the obvious, and only natural meaning of the language.—— But he knew that there would afterwards be numerous Congregations, conſiſting of many hundreds, to partake of this Ordinance; and that the Miniſter would not then be capable of taking up, and holding up in the time of Prayer, all the Bread to be uſed: That this would be impoſſible in ſuch caſes, as well as the having the whole Congregation accommodated in any large upper Room of a private dwelling-houſe; or the having them all placed together at once, about one Table.

Such are ſome Reaſons for the Doctrine of our Standards, in the point now under conſideration. And a further reaſon for it may be explained

ed afterwards; as it was a laying of the axe to the root of the tree of Romiſh and Engliſh ſuperſtition, in an Elevation of the Sacramental Elements.

PROPOSITION II.

Our Standards, concerning the Adminiſtration of the Lord's Supper,—are properly laid, for confining the *Symbolical* State of that Ordinance to the Line of Divine Inſtitution.

THERE is an eſſential diſtinction to be made, —betwixt what is *natural* and what is *ſymbolical*, in the Sacrament of the Supper. All Evangelical Worſhip, though in itſelf ſupernatural, muſt always be accompanied with ſome natural Things and Actions: And no Sacrament, or ſymbolical Ordinance, can poſſibly exiſt or be diſpenſed among Men, without being accompanied in the ſame manner. In the Sacrament of the Supper, the Bread and Wine are to be conſidered as natural Things all along; in oppoſition to the blaſphemous Abſurdity of Tranſubſtantiation: and there are natural Actions, — of ſpeaking, taking, breaking, giving, receiving, eating, and drinking.

As to what *Things* and *Actions* in this Sacrament

ment are *ſymbolical*, or bear the nature of inſtituted Signs and Seals, or are objectively ſignificative, — and in what reſpects they are ſo; all this can be determined only by our Lord's Inſtitution, as excluſive of all human devices in that matter. All his Inſtitution of the Ordinance lies in theſe words, [1 Cor. xi. 24, 25.]: *Take, eat, this is my Body which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me; — This Cup is the new Teſtament in my Blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.* By theſe words two Elements, continuing to be natural Bread and Wine, were laid under a ſtamp of Divine Inſtitution; as myſtical Signs or Symbols of Chriſt's broken Body and ſhed Blood, to the Faith of his Diſciples: Such were the *Symbolical Things.* By the ſame words, according to the myſtical relation which the Bread and Wine were now ſtated in to Chriſt himſelf, — his viſible giving thereof, though ſtill a natural Action, was made ſignificative of his ſpiritual giving of himſelf; and their viſible receiving thereof, tho' ſtill a natural action, was made ſignificative of receiving Chriſt himſelf by Faith; — a giving and receiving of him as Food for their Souls; his *Fleſh* as *Meat indeed*, and his *Blood* as *Drink indeed:* And ſuch were the *Symbolical Actions.*

But our Lord's Words of Inſtitution bear not the ſmalleſt Appearance, either directly or by any rational conſequence, — of his putting a myſtical

ſignification upon any thing elſe whatſoever in this Ordinance: No ſuch ſignification did he put, or any way lead his Diſciples to put, upon either the *Taking* or *Breaking*. So far as the Breaking was neceſſary, the Taking was a natural Action of indiſpenſable neceſſity for that purpoſe: And ſeeing the Bread was not to be made a Symbol of his broken Body, but as become *broken Bread*; the Breaking was a natural Action, abſolutely neceſſary likewiſe for this purpoſe. The *pouring out* of the *Wine* could not, in the nature of the thing, but be as fit for a myſtical ſignification as the Breaking of the Bread; yet there was not a ſyllable in the Inſtitution about this Action, the Wine having been already poured out into a Cup. The caſe of all theſe, as *Natural Actions* neceſſarily connected with the *Symbolical Things* and *Actions*, is quite plain and obvious in our Lord's Inſtitution: And he gave not the remoteſt hint of any other view in which they were to be conſidered.

Accordingly, the doctrinal definition of this Ordinance in our Standards moſt evidently admits of no *Symbolical Things*, except the *Bread* broken and the *Wine* poured out; nor admits of any *Symbolical Actions*, but the *Giving* and *Receiving* of thoſe; and particularly leaves no room for a *firſt* Taking, different from that which is in order to Breaking, as of any ſpiritual import to the Faith of Communicants.

PRO-

PROPOSITION III.

Our Standards, concerning the Adminiſtration of the Lord's Supper, — are laid in a proper and neceſſary Oppoſition to the Idolatrous Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*.

MANY ways has this Holy Ordinance been moſt wickedly corrupted, by that Idolatrous Church. Particularly, in the ſeventh century, above a thouſand years ago, — a practice was introduced of *lifting up* the conſecrated Elements, (not for an immediate Breaking and Giving, but) for ſhewing them to the People: Though it was not till about five hundred years afterwards, that this practice was gradually improved upon to groſs Idolatry; in lifting up and ſhewing theſe Elements as Objects of Adoration, upon the ground of the monſtrous Figment of Tranſubſtantiation *. Accordingly our *Confeſſion of Faith* ſtates the Doctrine of theſe Elements [chap. xxix. 4.] — in oppoſition to "the *lifting* them up, or carrying them "about for Adoration."

The ground of this Corruption lies in imagining, — as if the conſecrated Elements were chan-

* *Pareus*, on 1 Cor. xi.

ged into ſome religious importance, even in their viſible ſtate; or were become, in that ſtate, Objects of ſome religious Veneration. But, as is obſerved by the famous *Buxtorf**, — the change made upon the conſecrated Elements "is not a "change of the Subſtance or of the Quality, but "only of the *Relation*:" And it is only in this Relation which they bear to the Body and Blood of Chriſt, that they become Objects of any religious account. But this *Relation*, or the Elements as conſidered in this Relation, — cannot be an object of bodily ſight, for being lifted up and ſhewed to the People; being wholly an Object of Faith.

And if this *lifting of them up* (condemned by our Confeſſion) was an unwarrantable practice, even when they were conſecrated; it muſt rather be ſo before the Conſecration, when they are ſtill to be conſidered as of *common uſe*, — of no other Relation to Chriſt, of no other reſpectableneſs, than any other Bread and Wine.

* *Exercitatio de Cœna, Theſis* 48.

PRO-

PROPOSITION IV.

Our Standards, concerning the Adminiſtration of the Lord's Supper, — are laid in a proper and neceſſary Oppoſition to the Superſtitious Corruptions of the Epiſcopal Church of *England*.

By the *Liturgy* of the Church of *England* it is expreſsly preſcribed, that, in the very time of ſetting the Elements apart by Prayer, — "the "Prieſt is to take the Paten" (or Plate) "into "his Hands; to break the Bread; to lay his "Hand upon all the Bread: to take the Cup "into his Hand; and to lay his Hand upon every "Veſſel (be it Chalice or Flaggon) in which there "is any Wine to be conſecrated." And the ſame preſcription was contained in that *Liturgy* which was attempted to be impoſed upon the Church of *Scotland* in the laſt century.

Such *Taking* is evidently the ſame Thing, upon the matter, with the *Lifting up* above mentioned, — condemned by our Confeſſion of Faith: And it proceeds upon the ſame falſe ground, of imagining ſome holineſs put upon the Elements as conſidered in their viſible ſtate; not merely as conſidered in their inviſible Relation.

With regard to this Practice, a late Hiſtory of the

the famous Aſſembly 1638 bears the following paſſage, *viz.* "Againſt Mr *David Lindſay*, pre-"tended Biſhop of *Edinburgh*, it was found pro-"ven, that" (among other great ſcandals) "he "had been an Elevator" (or *Lifter-up*) "of the "Elements at Conſecration: For all which" (this among others) "the Aſſembly did depoſe and "excommunicate him *."

And yet this Taking, or lifting up, (for ſetting them down again), *in the Time* of conſecrating, was not ſo unaccountable as a like practice *before* Conſecration; when the Elements are ſtill in their common ſtate.

PROPOSITION V.

Our Standards, concerning the Adminiſtration of the Lord's Supper, —are properly laid, for excluding Superſtition about the *remaining Part* of the Elements.

It is preſcribed by the *Liturgy* of the Church of *England*, —that "if any remain of the Bread "and Wine which was conſecrated, it ſhall not "be carried out of the Church; but the Prieſt, "and ſuch other of the Communicants as he

* Stevenſon's Hiſtory, vol. 2. p. 629.

"ſhall

" ſhall then call unto him, ſhall, immediately after " the Bleſſing, reverently eat and drink the ſame."

That ſuperſtitious Regulation evidently proceeds upon a ſuppoſed *venerableneſs* communicated to the Elements by Conſecration, even in their material ſtate: And it is a native conſequence of the reſpect paid unto them, in that ſtate, by the Taking or Lifting up which has been conſidered. But our Standards, as excluding all reſpect of that ſort, — leave the remaining Elements to be uſed with the ſame freedom as any other Bread and Wine.

PROPOSITION VI.

Our Standards, concerning the Adminiſtration of the Lord's Supper, — are properly laid, for obviating *human Inventions*, in the Method of Adminiſtration.

All Divine Ordinances, and particularly this Sacrament, ought to be kept pure and entire; without any ſuch mixtures of their own Things, as men have been very generally diſpoſed to make. Our Reformation-Standards were ſpecially deſigned for correcting *former* abuſes of that ſort: and they are at the ſame time fitted for preventing *future* abuſes, in any ſuperadded Inventions of Men;

Men; ſome of which may be now mentioned. As,

1. It is a human Invention, — to turn a *mute* and *unmeaning* Action into a *religious* Action. If the *firſt Taking* of the Elements be uſed (as ſometimes) without any Senſe, or any ſpiritual Meaning put upon it, — and yet as a *religious* Action; how can this conſiſt with the eſſential Nature of Religion, as a reaſonable ſervice of God by reaſonable Creatures? A dumb Action, which has no Language given to it, no ſignification put upon it, — can have no Religion, while it has no religious Meaning in its performance.

2. It is a human Invention, — to take up the Elements unto a *ſetting them down again*, before any immediate uſe of them toward intended Communicants. It cannot be pretended, that there was any thing of this ſort in our Lord's Example: And by what authority can it be introduced into his Inſtitution? or is it to be ſuppoſed that the Miniſter's hand can put any ſacredneſs upon the Elements, even as ſet down again before Prayer?

3. It is a human Invention, — to have *two* Takings of the Elements in the Adminiſtration of this Sacrament. It can as little be pretended, that there was any thing of this ſort in our Lord's Example: In which there was manifeſtly but *one* Taking, and that for holding the Bread till breaking it.

4. It

4. It is a human Invention, — in taking up the Elements before Prayer, to take up only a *part* for the *whole*. It is unqueſtionable, that our Lord took up at once, the *whole* of what was to be ſacramentally uſed at the Inſtitution. But it has been proved, that his practice in this matter was not deſigned for imitation: The imitation muſt be found impracticable, in large Congregations: And an attempting to practiſe it muſt be directly, not a taking up of Bread, but of Plates in which it lies. —— And how can our Lord's Example, as to this matter, be imitated, in taking up a *part* only, — as a part for the whole; while he did no ſuch thing? Muſt not this be like making a part of the Elements a religious Repreſentation or Sign of the whole; as neceſſary in order to a making the whole Elements — Sacramental Signs of our Lord's Body and Blood?

5. It is a human Invention, — to uſe the Sacramental *Commemoration* of *Chriſt crucified*, as if it were a repreſenting of the *crucifying* of Chriſt; as if it were like a theatrical repreſentation, or the acting of a thing over again upon a ſtage. When the *firſt Taking* is uſed as of a myſtical ſignification, the *Breaking* comes natively to be uſed in the ſame manner; as if it repreſented the actual breaking of our Lord's Body, in the crucifying of him. —— Our Lord did not break his own Body, though he chearfully ſubmitted to be broken for his People. God, as a Judge, was primarily and

righteouſly concerned in the Breaking: But can a Miniſter, in his Act of Breaking, be ſuppoſed to perſonate the Righteous Judge? Devils, Jews, and Romans, were inſtrumentally, and moſt wickedly, concerned in the Breaking: But can the Miniſter be ſuppoſed to perſonate theſe? Shall he be conſidered, in diſpenſing that Ordinance, as theatrically or figuratively *crucifying the Son of God?*

That any thing like an *Acting* of the crucifixion of Chriſt, by the Act of *Breaking* the Bread, is quite foreign to the Nature and Deſign of this Ordinance, is perfectly evident, — from our Lord's not having uttered a Word, directly nor indirectly, for putting any ſuch ſignification upon that Act: The Diſciples were neither directed nor warranted, to take any thing which they ſaw on that occaſion as of a myſtical ſenſe; till (not the *Breaking* of the Bread nor the *Pouring* out of the Wine, but) the *Bread* broken and the *Wine* poured out were ſo ſet forth to them, by the Words of Inſtitution. —— Our Standards do therefore juſtly ſhut the door againſt this, with ſuch other Inventions as have been mentioned, in the manner before explained; and particularly, by repreſenting the Sacramental Supper as of our Lord's Inſtitution "for "the perpetual Remembrance of the Sacrifice of "himſelf in his Death, — a *Commemoration* of "that one offering up of himſelf by himſelf upon "the Croſs, once for all."

PRO-

PROPOSITION VII.

Our Standards, concerning the Adminiſtration of the Lord's Supper, — are properly laid, for maintaining the Sacramental *Unity* of that Holy Ordinance.

THIS Ordinance, though conſiſting of various Parts, of various Things and Actions, — is but *one* Sacrament. The *Matter* ſymbolically repreſented by it, is but *one*, — the glorious Myſtery of that Deceaſe which our Lord accompliſhed at Jeruſalem; in a ſymbolical Exhibition and Application of it to the Souls of his People: And it is but *one* complex *Repreſentation* which is thus made of it. The *Roman Antichriſt* has added *five* baſtard Sacraments to the *two* of Chriſt's Inſtitution; which all Proteſtants diſclaim: But the *Unity* of the *Sacramental Supper*, one of the two which our Lord inſtituted, ought alſo to be carefully maintained; in oppoſition to an adding upon the matter, of any new Sacraments, — by ſplitting that Sacrament, as it were, into more than *one*.

This great impropriety has been inconſiderately fallen into, over the ſpecious Stumbling-block, — of extending *Myſtical Significations*, in that Sa-

crament, beyond Scriptural Warrant. If our Lord's Words of Inſtitution, the only Rule of Judgement in this matter, be ſingly attended unto, — we cannot find ourſelves left at the ſmalleſt uncertainty about the true extent of that Warrant; not the ſmalleſt room left, for human ingenuity to practiſe upon it: And we cannot but run looſe into the Field of vain Imaginations, if we do not ſtedfaſtly maintain and conform ourſelves to it as a fundamental Principle; *That nothing is to be admitted of as* myſtical, *in the Sacrament of the Supper, but what our Lord hath put a* myſtical ſenſe *upon by the Words of Inſtitution.* Nothing can be more plain, — than that our Lord did put no myſtical ſignification upon the *Bleſſing*; or upon the *Taking*, either of the Bread or Cup: And that while he did put ſuch a ſignification upon the *Bread* broken and the *Wine* poured out, he put nothing of it upon the *Breaking* of the one or the *Pouring out* of the other; as it was no way intended, to make a Sacramental Commemoration of the wickedneſs of Men in that matter. And while our Standards are ſtrictly conformed to the Scriptural Nature and Extent of the Warrant for myſtical ſignifications, lying quite plain in the Words of Inſtitution, — as hath been explained; they are thus calculated for guarding the *Unity* of that Solemn Ordinance.

But let us ſee how the caſe ſtands, — upon extending the myſtical ſignifications to the *Bleſſing*, *Taking*,

Taking, and *Breaking:* or how the *one Sacrament* of the Supper is thus turned, upon the matter, into a *Cluſter* of Sacraments; while every complete inſtance of a myſtical or ſpiritual ſignification connected with a viſible Sign, to the Faith of Chriſtians, — muſt, in the nature of the thing, be an inſtance of a Sacrament. For it is pretended, that,

1. "As the *Bleſſing* of it does eminently mean "the ſetting of it apart for a ſacred purpoſe," (which is the only proper meaning); "ſo it may "point out Chriſt's ſolemn and volunteer dedi-"cating and ſetting of himſelf apart, according "to the will and authority of God, to be a ſacri-"fice for ſins." And here is a Sacrament of Chriſt's *Self-dedication.*

2. "Alſo the *Bleſſing* may ſignify, according to "ſome, his being ſet apart and conſecrated to, "and inveſted with the Mediatory Office by the "Father." And here is a Sacrament of Chriſt's *Inveſtiture* with the Mediatory Office.

3. "Chriſt's Action of *Taking* Bread; where-"in only and particularly we have his Authority "for the conſecrating of that Element rather than "any other, to be a Sign of his Body." And here is a Sacrament of Chriſt's *Authority.*

4. "The *Taking* may point out, Chriſt's moſt "chearful and hearty entering upon and going "through with theſe awful Sufferings which be-"longed to the Buſineſs of our Redemption:

"Chriſt's

" Chriſt's Taking of the Cup, which he bleſſed " along with the Bread, ſhews his chearful Ta- " king of the Cup of Wrath out of the Father's " Hand." And here is a Sacrament of Chriſt's *Chearfulneſs.*

5. " The *Taking* may ſignify Chriſt's diſplaying " of his Kingly Authority and Royal Bounty, in " ſetting up this new Ordinance in his Church." And here is a Sacrament of Chriſt's *Royal Bounty.*

6. " The *Taking* may mean, or repreſent, the " ſovereign and bleſſed Chuſing of Chriſt by the " Father." And here is a Sacrament of Chriſt's *Election.*

7. " The *Taking* may alſo ſignify the taking " of our Nature into perſonal Union to Divinity in " himſelf." And here is a Sacrament of Chriſt's *Incarnation* *.

8. " To

* A ſingular Conceit is fallen upon, as a new Argument for the *firſt Taking*; that it " may be uſed as an " Argument againſt Tranſubſtantiation: In taking of " it, it was clearly ſhown to be verily Bread; and by " breaking of it after Prayer, it was ſhown to be the " ſelf-ſame Bread; and ſo no change of its Subſtance " by conſecration in that Prayer." And ſo the ſilly Meaning muſt be, as if our Lord had ſaid before Prayer; Take notice, that this is mere Bread in my Hand: And then, at breaking after Prayer; Take notice, that this is mere Bread ſtill. Well, be it ſo: But is not the ſame purpoſe ſerved, equally at leaſt, by all ſeeing that it is mere

8. " To repreſent the *Breaking* as neceſſary, " only in order to Diſtribution, is to give us but " a mean View of it:" But it is well enough known, that, beſide the further neceſſity of this for conſtituting the Element of *broken Bread*, as a Sign of Chriſt's broken Body; the actual *Breaking* of the Bread is ſuppoſed to repreſent the actual *Breaking* or *Crucifying* of Chriſt. And ſo here is another Sacrament; not merely of Chriſt crucified, but alſo of the *Crucifixion*.

Thus, the *one* Sacrament of the Supper is grievouſly miſrepreſented, as if it did comprehend *eight* other Sacraments. —— Inſtead of being an Apology for this, it is a falſe and very dangerous Principle; That " the Words of Inſtitution, con-

mere Bread which is ſet before the Miniſter, — not yet affected by his Touch or Word; and mere Bread ſtill, in his breaking the ſame?

It is alſo pretended, — that " the miniſterial *Taking* of " the Bread is an exhibiting, as it were to the very ſight, " the truth and reality of Food being in that Ordinance " for the Soul; therefore they may heartily and chearfully join in Prayer for the Divine bleſſing." Thus, it ſeems, the *common* or *unconſecrated* Bread doth ſacramentally repreſent the truth and reality of Food for the Soul; and People have to join in aſking a Bleſſing upon it as *already* of that Spiritual Character, *before* it come to be ſo! —— But, beſide the Abſurdity of ſuch Exhibiting, it ought to ſtrike Proteſtants with Horror; if they alſo had even the *unconſecrated* Elements held up to them as a kind of ſhow, with ſome ſuch Language concerning the ſame as in *John* i. 29.

" taining

" taining no particular ſignification of this his ta-
" king Bread, plainly implies, that it is left to us
" at large, in ſearching the Scriptures, to gather
" the Meaning thereof: In ſtudying the Scrip-
" tures, we are to learn both the extenſive and
" genuine Meaning of this Ordinance, in its dif-
" ferent Parts; and not merely and reſtrictedly
" from the Words of Inſtitution themſelves."
And is it then a lame or defective Record, which the *Evangeliſts* and *Paul* have made of this Ordinance; that we muſt labour to ſupply the defect, from other parts of the Holy Scriptures? Is not that Ordinance to be conſidered as diſtinct, in a fulneſs of Inſtitution; or may we manufacture it into ſomething more complete, by what we think proper to incorporate with it from other ſcriptures?

A ſpiritualizing of natural things, is what men may deal in otherwiſe to a great latitude, — without being reckoned erroneous, however injudicious in their applications; ſo long as they keep within the bounds of Scripture-truth. But the caſe is quite different, as to a Sacramental Ordinance. Any ſpritual meanings which we can bring into it, — are, from the nature of the thing, made *Sacramental* Meanings; ſuch ſpiritualizing is a putting of myſtical ſignifications upon viſible Signs, or it can have no place in a Sacrament: And there is ſomething tremendous, in preſuming to incorporate our myſtical ſenſes with thoſe which

which have been impoſed and authoriſed by our Lord, — who is ſtill the ſame Holy One, as in the days of the *Men of Bethſhemeſh* and of *Uzza*. What foundation is there for Faith, as to a connection betwixt the Signs and the Things ſignified, in ſuch ſpiritualizings? None, but in the deluſive ground of our Imaginations.

It is far from being enough, that the Meanings be good; that "it does not appear that it can be "juſtly ſaid, that any of them in themſelves are "improper matter of meditation in partaking of "this Sacrament:" as it is far from being enough to warrant the uſe of Surplices in ſacred miniſtrations, or of the Sign of the Croſs in Baptiſm, — that theſe have excellent Meanings put upon them. It is undoubtedly very proper, in partaking of the Sacrament, to be meditating upon many things in Scripture which bear a Relation to it: But this ſays nothing for admitting any good *Meanings* into the rank of *Myſtical Significations*, — beyond what lie in the Nature of that Sacrament, according to Divine Inſtitution. It is one thing, to have theſe good Meanings for ſubjects of Meditation at partaking of the Ordinance; and a quite other thing, to have them ſacramentally incorporated with the ſame.

It is indeed much to be regretted, that Divines, and ſome among thoſe of the beſt note, — have too commonly given way to ſuch ſpiritualizing as is now ſpoken of: And even *Witſius*, one of the

moſt eminent Divines of the Reformed Churches, though otherwiſe remarkably accurate and judicious,—has remarkably failed as to this matter, in his *OEconomy of the Covenants*. But, in all Ages of the Church, the greateſt Men have wrote inconſiderately and unguardedly,—about Matters not then in controverſy. And though the opinions of eminent Men are to be admitted as of great Weight, in Things which are truly diſputable: yet they are lighter than a Feather, when laid in the Balance againſt what is plain and abſolutely certain from Scripture-teſtimony; as in the caſe which has now been explained and vindicated.

There is nothing ſcriptural which can be oppoſed, in this caſe, but the mere Form and Sound of the Expreſſions; *The Lord Jeſus took Bread, and when he had given Thanks he brake it.* But where will Men land, in other caſes,—if they ſhould think it enough, to run away injudiciouſly with the Letter of detached Scriptures? They may run into all the Foolery of ſome Sectaries; about having all Things in common, ſaluting one another with an holy Kiſs, waſhing the Feet of the Diſciples,—and all prophecying (or exerciſing their Gifts of Teaching) one by one, in public Church-meetings. Yea, if one ſhould take it into his Head, he might as eaſily write a Pamphlet about the Neceſſity and Importance of uſing unleavened Bread only at the Sacramental Supper, as our Lord certainly did; and in as plauſible

a

a manner, as about the Neceſſity and Importance of taking the Bread before Prayer.

The Author of this Defence will be much injured, if he ſhould be ſuppoſed to mean a hard Reflection upon any who have practically contravened our Standards in the preſent caſe, — from inconſiderate Imitation without Examination. But if one will pretend Conſcience, in a reſolute practiſing of ſuch oppoſition to them; he had much need to conſider how this can be reconciled with profeſſing clearneſs of Conſcience, for coming under ſolemn and *unexcepting* Vows to maintain and obſerve them.

Vindiciæ Dominicæ:

PART II.

A *Defence* of the Doctrine of our Standards, concerning the ONE SONSHIP of JESUS CHRIST.

IN July laſt year, the Author of this Defence publiſhed a *Sermon* under the following title; *An Antidote againſt a* new Hereſy, *concerning the true* SONSHIP *of* JESUS CHRIST. The Hereſy meant was indeed abſolutely *new*; never having been heard of among Mankind, till it was brought forth by a Book publiſhed in the preceding year. And it is a Hereſy perhaps the moſt *monſtrous* that ever was conceived in a human mind: An Attempt to overthrow the ETERNAL GENERATION of the SON OF GOD; by aſcribing to him, in its place, a TEMPORAL SONSHIP only,—upon the fanciful principles of ANIMALCULAR GENERATION, as the proper *Teſt* and *Criterion* of the Myſtery of his Sonſhip: The ridiculous and horrid Impiety of which Scheme

Scheme was expoſed, by an *Appendix* to the aforeſaid Sermon.

It is one Inſtance of the Bounds which the Lord mercifully ſets to the Spirit of Error, even in this Day of Blaſphemy; that the Author of the ſaid Hereſy has his Confuſion already covering him; with regard to the baſe but fundamental Principle of it, in the Theory of *Animalcular Generation*. For though he has publiſhed an Attack upon the Sermon above mentioned, it contains not a ſyllable in defence of his *Animalcular* Syſtem; but that Subſtance and very Soul of his new Hereſy has been left to expire, ſoon after Birth, in moſt deſerved Ignominy.

And in what manner, then, has he managed his Attack upon that Sermon? It is by a heretical wreſting of the Scriptures which had been brought, to prove the *Eternal Generation* of the *Son of God*. But this cannot be called a new Hereſy: For his wreſting of theſe Scriptures is in concurrence with, if not copied from the *Socinians*, particularly in their *Racovian Catechiſm*; juſt borrowing the Weapons by which they wickedly fought, againſt both the *Divinity* and *Eternal Generation* of JESUS CHRIST. Only, he gives a new Turn to their damnable Error; by caſting an impious Charge of ſelf-contradiction upon our Lord's eſſential and perſonal Characters: In miſrepreſenting the Truth of his *Eternal Sonſhip*, as inconſiſtent with the Truth of his *Self-exiſtence*

and

and *Supreme Deity.* And it required an uncommon meaſure of Aſſurance, to ſtate this great Impiety, with his *Socinian* perverſion of theſe Scriptures, as an Attack only upon Mr *Gib*, — with many nauſeous Repetitions of that Name: while, as he perfectly knew, the Plea which he manages is neither only nor peculiarly againſt that Perſon; but is equally levelled againſt all Chriſtian Churches, upon the face of the whole Earth, — ſo that all theſe are equally the Objects of the virulent Reproaches which are caſt upon him.

To the Defence of the TRUE *Sonſhip* of Jeſus Chriſt, as by *Eternal Generation*, — there is a preſent neceſſity for adding a Defence of the ONENESS of his *Sonſhip*; in oppoſition to a revived Error upon that ſubject, as if a *twofold* Sonſhip belonged to him. And,

I. THE Doctrine of the *One Sonſhip* of Chriſt is evidently comprehended in the following Paſſages of our Reformation-Standards, as laid down from the Scriptures of Truth.

Shorter Catechiſm, [*Anſ.* to *Queſt.* 21.] "The "only Redeemer of God's Elect is the Lord Je- "ſus Chriſt, who, being the Eternal Son of God, "became Man; and ſo was and continueth to be "God and Man, in two diſtinct Natures and one "Perſon for ever."

Larger Catechiſm, [*Anſ.* to *Queſt.* 36.] "The "only

" only Mediator of the Covenant of Grace is the " Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who, being the Eternal Son " of God, of one ſubſtance and equal with the " Father, in the fulneſs of time became Man: " and ſo was, and continues to be God and Man, " in two entire diſtinct Natures, and one Perſon " for ever."

Confeſſion of Faith, [*chap.* viii. 1, 2.] " It " pleaſed God, in his Eternal Purpoſe, to chuſe " and ordain the Lord Jeſus, his only begotten " Son, to be the Mediator between God and " Man.——The Son of God, the Second Perſon " in the Trinity, being very and Eternal God, of " one Subſtance and equal with the Father; did, " when the fulneſs of time was come, take upon " him Man's Nature, with all the eſſential Pro- " perties and common Infirmities thereof, yet " without Sin: Being conceived by the Power " of the Holy Ghoſt, in the Womb of the Vir- " gin *Mary*, of her Subſtance: So that two " whole, perfect, and diſtinct Natures, the God- " head and the Manhood, were inſeparably join- " ed together in one Perſon; without converſion, " compoſition, or confuſion: Which Perſon is " very God and very Man, yet one Chriſt, the " only Mediator between God and Man."

The above Paſſages may be illuſtrated, by the following Obſervations.

1. In theſe, as in other Paſſages, the glorious *Sonſhip* of Chriſt by *Eternal Generation* — is clearly

clearly taught: That he is the Eternal and only-begotten Son of God, the Second Perſon in the Trinity; very and Eternal God, of the ſame Subſtance and equal with the Father.

2. In theſe Paſſages, but *one* Sonſhip of Chriſt is acknowledged. No other Sonſhip is aſcribed to him who is the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, become Man, in the ſtate of the only Mediator between God and Man; no other but that which belongs to him as the Eternal Son of God, the Second Perſon in the Trinity: The One Chriſt, very God and very Man in one Perſon,— is the Eternal and only-begotten Son of God, in his Incarnate and Mediatory capacity.

3. What is not *acknowledged* in our Standards, as to this matter, is abſolutely *excluded:* All Doctrine of a *twofold* Sonſhip of Chriſt, or of any other Sonſhip than the *one* which is therein expreſſed, — muſt be conſidered as in a ſtate of condemnation by them.

For, as is elſewhere obſerved *, — "The particular uſe of our Reformation-Standards, is for being *Teſts of Orthodoxy and Soundneſs in the Faith*; and to ſhut the door againſt Errors: or to prevent the teaching of any thing about the Subjects there handled, different from or contrary to what is therein evidently contained. If the Principles of Church-members, and eſpe-

* *Diſplay of the Seceſſion-Teſtimony*, vol. 2. p. 184, 185.

"cially

" cially of public Teachers in the Church, are not " to be meaſured and known by her public " Standards; or if the door be left open, for " teaching other points which lie beyond the ſub- " ject-matter of theſe Standards,—under the pre- " tence of a full conſiſtency therewith: Theſe " Standards, very plainly undermined, muſt then " be very uſeleſs. —— When our Reformation- " Standards of Doctrine do treat of any ſubject, " they do it *generally*; without giving any hint, " as if they only took a limited and particular way " of handling the ſubject,—or were leaving out " ſome part of the matter: And thus they pro- " feſs to take in the whole extent or compaſs of " the ſubject; ſo as to exclude every thing from " belonging thereto which is not comprehended " in, falling within the compaſs of theſe Stand- " ards."

It is therefore quite unqueſtionable, that the Doctrine of a *Twofold* Sonſhip of Chriſt is inconſiſtent with our Standards; and highly inconſiſtent with ſolemn Vows for adhering to the Doctrine there taught from the Word of God.

II. The Sermon before mentioned contains the following Remark, *viz.* " The Eternal Genera- " tion of the Son of God is ſuch, as could be- " come a matter of promiſe. ——So it is in Scrip- " ture, [Pſal. lxxxix. 27. Heb. i. 5.]: *I will* " *make him my Firſt-born, higher than the*

" *Kings of the Earth; I will be to him a Fa-*
" *ther, and he ſhall be to me a Son.* But this did
" no way ſignify his beginning in time to be ſuch;
" it only reſpected a glorious manifeſtation in
" time, of his being ſuch: As, in Scripture, — a
" thing is ſaid to be made, when eminently ma-
" nifeſted to be. So was Jeſus, in and after his
" Reſurrection, *made both Lord and Chriſt,*
" [Acts ii. 36.]; glorioufly revealed then in theſe
" Characters, while he had borne them as really
" before. —— And his being *called the Son of*
" *God* upon his Incarnation [Luke i. 35.], was a
" thing altogether different from his beginning
" then to be ſo."

The Author conceived, that this Remark was neceſſary, — to prevent an objection from the two Texts firſt mentioned in it, againſt the Doctrine of the Eternal Generation: And he apprehends it to be the only true way of explaining theſe Texts in a conformity with that Doctrine.

But an unprovoked Temper, which he is well known to be a ſpecial Object of, hath forced a vent for itſelf, — at the great Expence of Goſpel-truth; by foiſting in an underhand contradiction to the above Remark, without any occaſion from the ſubject otherwiſe handled: In the following terms.

" Chriſt is the Son of God, in a *twofold* ſenſe:
" 1. As the μονογενὴς, the *only-begotten* of the
" Father, *John* i. 14, 18. and iii. 16. 1 *John* iv. 9.

" —— A

" —— A Sonſhip that could not poſſibly be the " matter of any promiſe, fœderal compact, coun- " ſel or decree; more than the Divine Eſſence, " or the Being of God."

" 2. He is the Son of God as the πρωτότοκος, " the *Firſt-born*, *Rom.* viii. 29. *Col.* i. 15, 18. " *Heb.* i. 6. This Sonſhip is altogether depend- " ent on will, or choice; and is the matter of " glorious Promiſe made in Eternity, *Pſal.* lxxxix. " 27. * —— He is the *Firſt-born*, as to the Pur- " poſe

* A fond Remark is made upon this Text, from the *Syriac* Old Teſtament; " the word *Bechor*, Firſt-born, " is in the Syriac *Buchro* emphatic." But no place it ſeems could be found, in the Doctrine of the Twofold Sonſhip, for retailing any Criticiſms upon the Words of the *Syriac* Verſion of the New Teſtament; a Practice liberally, though vainly uſed, in the Doctrine of the Sacrament. And it is ſomewhat odd, to celebrate that Verſion, —as " judged to have been, in the concluding " of it, under the eye and inſpection of *John*, the laſt of " the Apoſtles: " Though it rejects a moſt eſſential part of his *Firſt* Epiſtle [v. 7.], with his *Second* and *Third* Epiſtles, and his whole Book of *Revelation*; and though the Syrian Chriſtians themſelves profeſs ignorance, about when and by whom their Verſion now extant was made. [*Leuſdeni Diſſertatio de Verſione Syriacâ.*]

That aſſiſtance is to be had from the *Syriac* Language for underſtanding the *Greek* New Teſtament, with regard to a very few words of the ſaid Language which are there uſed, will be readily allowed: But that otherwiſe the original Text is to be interpreted, by criticiſms upon the Etymology and Emphaſis of the Words of a

" poſe of God in Election, *Rom.* viii. 29. —— " And he is alſo the *Firſt-born*, as to the Power " of God in Reſurrection, *viz.* unto pure Im- " mortality, or unto the being beyond all reach " of dying any more, *Col.* i. 18. compared with " *Rom.* vi. 9."

" With regard to this his *Sonſhip* as the *Firſt-* " *born*, it is no way conſtitutive of Perſonality; " more than Sonſhip among Men by Adoption is. " It is only conſtitutive of a new Relation, that " never was before; and declarative of Perſonali- " ty, as being really and neceſſarily prior unto any " ſuch relation.

" Neither may this *twofold Sonſhip* of Chriſt " be confounded, without driving into whirlpools

Language into which it is tranſlated, — or of any other Words than thoſe of the original Text itſelf; is a bold ſtroke at the authenticity of that Original, as ſubjecting it to the Standard of a Tranſlation. And it is hoped that few Students of Divinity will be got over, by the warmeſt recommendation of ſuch criticizing, into the whirlpool of arbitrary notions about the proper ſenſe of Holy Scripture.

And they have the more need to be on their guard, in this matter; that while ſome Writers, tho' far above dealing in ſuch chimerical criticiſms, have otherwiſe been even ſomewhat rapturous in praiſing the *Syriac* Verſion, — as caſting what is now called " a ſhine of light upon many " places through the New Teſtament: " Yet the chief inſtances which they have produced (as in *Matth.* vi. 11. *Acts* iii. 21. 1 *Cor.* x. 2.) are rather debaſing *Corrections*, than real *Illuſtrations* of the ſacred Text.

" of

" of the moſt deſtroying Errors, and ſetting up-
" on the moſt wretched torturing of ſacred Scrip-
" ture. As to the Incarnation of Chriſt, it was
" only executive of that Divine Purpoſe, where-
" by he was in Eternity conſtituted the Firſt-born;
" but was no *conſtituting additional* unto his
" Perſonality. If HE had pre-exiſtence, the ſame
" HE had Perſonality complete; and that Incar-
" nation could conſtitute nothing of his Perſona-
" lity, but only a *new Relation* of Perſonality:
" And by this *new Relation* made in the Decree,
" and executed in Time, this glorious HE became
" fit to be a Mediator; and the Firſt-born Son, in
" God's Family of Grace."

III. WITHOUT regarding any thing of new Phraſeology, or of vain Philoſophy, or of blundering Virulence,—in the Quotation laſt made; ſeveral things may be obſerved, concerning the new Theology of it.

1. When it is ſaid, that Chriſt's Sonſhip by Eternal Generation " could not poſſibly be the
" matter of any Promiſe, fœderal Compact, Coun-
" ſel or Decree; more than the Divine Eſſence,
" or the Being of God:" If this Obſervation is meant of his Eternal Sonſhip in reſpect of *Being*, the making of it is a piece of unprovoked abuſe; as bearing a calumnious inſinuation, that ſome had taught the contrary, which is utterly falſe. But that this Sonſhip could not poſſibly be the

matter

matter of any Promiſe, in reſpect of new or more eminent *Manifeſtation*, — ought not to have been aſſerted, without being alſo proved: And it will be as eaſily proved (againſt the Apoſtle *Peter*), that he could not be ſaid to be *made both Lord and Chriſt* in and after his Reſurrection; without a blaſphemous meaning, that he had not been really ſo before.

2. The ſenſe here put upon the word πρωτότοκος, *Firſt-born*, as if it meant a *Second* Sonſhip of Chriſt with reſpect to God the Father, — is very different from that which has been put upon it, by our approved Critics and Commentators. In its literal ſenſe, it means one who firſt opens the Womb, whether others follow or not; and properly agrees to the Mother only, as Chriſt was Mary's *Firſt-born Son*, Matth. i. 25. Luke ii. 7. *

According to *Stockius*, an eminent Critic on the Words of the *Greek* New Teſtament; this Word is metaphorically applied to Chriſt, in an alluſion to the Rights of Primogeniture, or of the Firſt-born, under the Law: For denoting his Primacy, Excellency, or Pre-eminence above all others.

According to *Henry*'s Continuators [on *Rom.* viii. 29.], *That he might be the Firſt-born* ſignifies; "That Chriſt might have the honour of "being the great Pattern, as well as the great "Prince; and in this, as in all other things, might

* Piſcator and Pareus, *apud* Leigh.

"have

" have pre-eminence: It was in the Firſt-
" born, that all the Children were dedicated to
" God under the Law; the Firſt-born was the
" Head of the Family, on whom all the reſt did de-
" pend: Now, in the Family of the Saints, Chriſt
" muſt have the honour of being the Firſt-born."
And [on *Col.* i. 15], " it ſignifies his dominion
" over all things, as the Firſt-born in a Family is
" Heir and Lord of all." And [on *verſe* 18.],
it ſignifies, " That he was the Firſt and only one
" who roſe by his own Power, — the Head of the
" Reſurrection."

And according to Dr *Guyſe* [on *Rom.* viii. 29.], it ſignifies, " That he might have the dignity of
" being the Prince, Ruler, and Chief of a nume-
" rous Family." And [on *Col.* i. 15.], it ſigni-
fies, that he is " the original Lord and Heir of
" all, according to the Ancient Rights of the Firſt-
" born." And [on *verſe* 18.], " the firſt that a-
" roſe from the dead to immortal Life, and that
" by his own Power; as the Pledge and Pattern,
" quickening Cauſe, and Firſt-fruits of the Re-
" ſurrection of all that ſleep in him." And [on
" *Heb.* i. 6.], " The Lord and Heir of all." ——
And according to *Beza* [on *Rom.* viii. 29.], *Firſt-born* ſignifies his being " the Head of the Family;
" in whom, as the natural Son, we are choſen and
" adopted *."

And according to Dr *Owen* [on *Heb.* i. 6.],

* *Apud* Polum.

Chriſt's

Chriſt's being the *Firſt-born of every Creature* ſignifies his being "Heir and Lord of them all." And he adds as follows; "The Lord Chriſt is "never abſolutely called the Firſt-begotten or the "*Firſt-born*, with reſpect to either his Eternal "Generation, or to the Conception and Nativity "of his Human Nature,—it is the Dignity and "Privilege that attended being the Firſt-born, "which are deſigned in this Appellation,—Heir "of all, which was the Privilege of the Firſt-"born; — the Lord Chriſt, by the Appointment "of the Father, being intruſted with the whole "Inheritance of Heaven and Earth, and Authori-"ty to diſpoſe of it, that he might give out Por-"tions to all the reſt of God's Family; is, and "is called the *Firſt-born* thereof."

Such has been the received Senſe hitherto; while theſe Critics and Divines were utter ſtrangers to the Doctrine of a *Second Sonſhip*, in the word πρωτότοκος.

3. This Sonſhip, as to what particular ſort it muſt be underſtood to be of, is left in much obſcurity, under looſe and indefinite terms; with pretended Illuſtrations, which are both inconſiſtent and unintelligible. —— That it is a metaphorical Sonſhip by creation, ſuch as is aſcribed to Angels and Men, will not be pretended: nor that it is a Sonſhip from the peculiar Conception and Nativity of the Human Nature; in which Senſe, the Term refers only to the Virgin *Mary*: nor that

that it is a Sonſhip from gracious Efficacy, as in the Regeneration of true Chriſtians. And it is needleſs to take particular notice of various Senſes in which the word *Son* is uſed through the Scripture; ſo far as it is only a mere external or figurative, affectionate or civil, — and tranſitory Denomination: For none of theſe Senſes will be alledged, in the preſent caſe.

All other Sonſhip, with reſpect to God the Father, — muſt be ſuch as means a diſtinguiſhing, perſonal, and permanent Relation to him: And no other diſtinction of ſuch Sonſhip is imaginable, but into *Natural* and *Adoptive*. The natural Sonſhip of Chriſt, by Eternal Generation, is not here meant; and therefore it can only be an adoptive Sonſhip: That Jeſus Chriſt, in reſpect of his Incarnate and Mediatory State, is the Son of God by *Adoption*. It is vain to demur at this Term, ſo as to leave the pretended Sonſhip without a Name; while no other, of any diſtinguiſhing ſenſe, can be got for it. The general Meaning of *Adoption*, with regard to Perſons, is, — the taking of one, from mere Pleaſure and Good-will, into a Relation of *Sonſhip* which did not naturally or originally belong to him: And this is the Senſe, this is the ſort of Sonſhip now aſcribed to Chriſt; or it is nothing at all. Nor can the preſent Doctrine of this Sonſhip bear any other Meaning, when it is ſaid to be "altogether de-"pendent on Will or Choice; conſtitutive of a

" *new Relation*, that never was before:" and is expreſsly taken into a Compariſon with " Sonſhip " among Men by Adoption. —— When another Sonſhip is aſcribed to Chriſt beſide that which is *proper*, by *Generation*; it muſt certainly be the moſt perfect kind of *improper* Sonſhip, which is that by *Adoption*: And to queſtion the Character *Adoptive*, as applied to the *Second* Sonſhip now taught, would be an outrage on Human Underſtanding, — with regard to the uſe of Language. It muſt therefore ſtand, as a point beyond all controverſy; That the *Second* Sonſhip meant, is, as it muſt be, a Sonſhip of Jeſus Chriſt by *Adoption*.

IV. Few Errors have appeared in theſe latter days, but by way of Revival; Errors long ago dead and buried, reſtored to a new Life: And ſuch is the Caſe of that now under conſideration.

It was broached near a thouſand years ago, about the year 783, by two Spaniſh Biſhops, — *Fælix* and *Elipandus*; who got a number of Followers *. They readily acknowledged, that, in reſpect of his Divine Perſon, Chriſt is the Son of God by Eternal Generation; the true, proper, and natural Son of God: But they alſo taught, that, in his Incarnate State, he is an *Adoptive* Son; or the Son of God by *Adoption*. This Doctrine

* Forbeſii *Inſtructiones Hiſtorico-Theologicæ*, *p.* 52, 294, — 296. Maſtricht *Theologia*, lib. viii. cap. 3. art. 32.

was

was a ſubject of warm Controverſy, in thoſe days: eſpecially from conſidering it under the form of an Attempt to bring in again, by a back-door, the *Neſtorian* Hereſy, — which aſcribed *two Perſons* to Chriſt; as what might be inferred from aſcribing *two Sonſhips* to him. It accordingly underwent various condemnations by particular Synods, in different places: And in the year 794, it was condemned under the Character of the *Adoptian* or *Adoptionarian Hereſy*; by a general Synod at *Franckfort*, — convened from Italy, France, Germany, and Britain.

That Controverſy having been now ſo long dead and buried, in the ſuppreſſion of the ſaid Error; it may well enough be ſuppoſed, that few, in our time, have had occaſion of acquaintance with it. And this may account for the Inconſiderateneſs by which ſome, otherwiſe ſound in the Faith, have ſtumbled into ſomething of the ſame Error; without adverting to the real import and conſequence of it. Even the eſtimable Mr *Boſton* was not on his guard, as to this matter; when, in his *View of the Covenant of Grace*, he aſcribed to Chriſt "a *new* kind of *Intereſt* in God as his *Fa-* "*ther.*" But ſome, who know circumſtances, will find a conſiderable ſtretch of Charity needful, — for viewing the Blunder now referred to in as favourable a light.

V. It yet remains, to produce ſome Conſide-

rations for expoſing the Error of this *Adoptian* or *Adoptionarian* Doctrine; including ſome things which were oppoſed to it, in the period above referred to. And,

1. It has been manifeſted, that our Standards acknowledge no *Second* Sonſhip of Chriſt; yea that they leave no room to introduce, but exclude all Doctrine of ſuch a Sonſhip: And for a good Reaſon; when no ſuch Doctrine is to be found in the Holy Scriptures. Where can it be found in them? When a Promiſe was made, as before obſerved, about a future glory of his *Eternal* Sonſhip; can this juſtly infer *another* Sonſhip? Or will a novel wreſting of a *Greek* Word, which has been expoſed, be a ſufficient foundation for this new Fabric? No other grounds are yet pretended: Nor is there one ſyllable of Scripture-doctrine about *two Sonſhips* of Chriſt; or which can be drawn over to that Senſe, otherwiſe than by arbitrary Suppoſitions. Different *Eſtates* of our Lord Jeſus, as the Saviour of Men, are plainly taught there; his Eſtates of Incarnation, Mediation, Humiliation, and Exaltation: But nothing about a *new Eſtate* of acquired, *adoptive* Sonſhip: — and therefore ſuch a new Eſtate ſhould have no room in the Faith of Chriſtians; no *Plurality* of Sonſhips is to be believed, when the Scripture reveals but *one*.

2. The ſuppoſition of a *twofold Sonſhip* is nowiſe neceſſary, for explaining the Scripture-doctrine

trine about Jeſus Chriſt as the Son of God; or for extricating ourſelves from difficulties, about reconciling the various parts of that Doctrine.—— Men may go far with little danger upon Subjects of Philoſophy, in attempting to explain difficulties by new *Hypotheſes*,—Suppoſitions, or Principles aſſumed without Proof; ſuch as the Hypotheſes that belong to the *Copernican* and *Newtonian* Syſtems of Philoſophy,—which, if not fact, are at leaſt feaſible. But we muſt uſe no Freedoms of this ſort, about the Syſtem of Scripture-Truth; nor is there any real occaſion for doing ſo, in the preſent caſe.

The SON, indeed, is frequently repreſented by the Scriptures,—as in a ſtate of *Inferiority* or *Subordination* to the FATHER; while he is ſo repreſented, only in his *Official* or Mediatory capacity. But if we may infer from this an *inferior* ſort of *Sonſhip* belonging to him as Mediator, *another* Sonſhip beſide that *one* which is neceſſary and Eternal; we may as well infer from it an *inferior* ſort of *Divinity* belonging to him as Mediator, *another* Divinity beſide that which is eſſential to him: Becauſe it is the *whole Divine Perſon*, GOD the SON become alſo Man, who is repreſented in that ſtate of inferiority. His official ſubordination to the Father, while it is a moſt certain and precious Truth, is a myſtery altogether incomprehenſible by us,—to be believed, but not to be fathomed by the line of our Suppoſitions:

And

And as we are not to ſuppoſe, that he laid aſide his *Supreme Godhead* in his Official State; as little are we to ſuppoſe that he therein laid aſide his *Eternal Sonſhip*, for poſſeſſing an *Adoptive* Sonſhip, as more competent to his Mediatory Office. *Eternal Sonſhip* belongs to him *as Mediator*; becauſe *Supreme Godhead* AS in the Perſon of the Eternal Son, and in a ſtate of Union with Humanity, — belongs to him as Mediator. And ſo the Truth of the Goſpel cannot be properly maintained, concerning the *Supreme Divinity* of the Mediator; if we ſhould ſuppoſe that his *Eternal* Sonſhip gives place to an *Adoptive* Sonſhip, as he bears that Office: For ſeeing the Mediator is no otherwiſe revealed to us as the Moſt High God, than as God ſubſiſting in the Perſon of the Eternal Son; if *Eternal Sonſhip* be excluded, *Supreme Godhead* muſt alſo be excluded from belonging to him as Mediator. —— But the Oppoſers of the old Adoptionarians did juſtly argue from Scripture, [particularly John i. 18. iii. 16. *Rom.* viii. 32.]; that the Characters of the *Only-begotton Son* of God, *his own proper Son*, — are aſcribed to Chriſt in his Mediatory capacity, or as Mediator: while he is plainly ſpoken of as ſuch, in theſe Paſſages.

In his Mediatory State, the Glory of his *Eternal Sonſhip* is diſplayed, as well as the Glory of his *Supreme Godhead*, — in the way of wonderful condeſcenſion. He condeſcends to acknowledge his

his People as *Brethren*, who are taken into a joint-heirſhip with him as their Elder Brother; and alſo *the God of the whole Earth*, in their Nature, is their *Huſband:* But ſtill there remains an infinite Diſtance between his Sonſhip and theirs, as much as between his Divinity and their Humanity; while their Relation to him as Brethren reſpects him in his *Natural* not an *Adoptive* Sonſhip, — they taken in as *Adoptive Sons*, to a moſt glorious and inconceivable fellowſhip with him AS the *Natural Son of God* from all Eternity. And how much muſt the Glory of this Myſtery be ſunk, by conſidering it as the Condeſcenſion only of an *Adopted* Son — toward other Adopted Sons as his Brethren! Dr *Owen* [on *Heb.* i. 6.] well obſerves; "If this were ſo, that the "Lord Chriſt and Believers were the Sons of "God by the ſame kind of Sonſhip, only differ-"ing in degrees, (which alſo are imaginary, for "the formal reaſon of the ſame kind of Sonſhip "is not capable of variation by degrees): What "great matter is in the condeſcenſion mentioned "by the Apoſtle [chap. ii. 11.], that *he is not* "*aſhamed to call them Brethren*; which yet "he compares with the condeſcenſion of God, in "being called *their God* [chap. xi. 16.]!"

3. A *twofold Sonſhip* of Chriſt, now pretended, is inconſiſtent with any rational view of the *Unity* of his *Perſon*; as it was not a Human Perſon that he aſſumed, — but only Human Nature, to

to a Subſiſtence in his one Divine Perſon.——We have to believe a number of Divine Myſteries, which lie far above the comprehenſion of our Reaſon; but nothing is to be admitted of in that view, when manifeſtly ſubverſive of the very Firſt Principles of rational Apprehenſion. And ſuch is this Doctrine,—that one and the ſame Perſon, at one and the ſame time, can be both the *Proper* and *Adopted* Son of one and the ſame Father: or that a Father can make his *Proper* Son an *Adopted* Son; while Adoption eſſentially ſuppoſes the Perſon adopted to have been, before his Adoption,—an *Alien* from the Father unto whom, and from the Family into which he is adopted; or, in other words, Adoption eſſentially ſuppoſes the *Adopted* Son never to have been a *Proper* Son.

And it is not a *Nature*, but only a *Perſon*, who can be an Object of Adoption: ſo that the aſcribing of a *twofold Sonſhip* to Chriſt, appears to lie in the way toward an aſcribing alſo of a *twofold Perſonality* to him; the Doctrine of *two Sonſhips*, one proper and the other adoptive,—ſeeming to imply the Doctrine of *two Sons*. And, as was urged of old; "How can he be *one Son*, both "proper and adoptive, of one Father? But that "he is *two Sons*, one proper and another ad-"optive, is moſt unwarrantable (*nefandiſſimum*) "to believe of Chriſt."

To the ſame purpoſe was the reaſoning of *Paulinus*, againſt *Felix* the chief Leader of the old Adop-

Adoptionarians : —— " We do not divide Chriſt " into two Sons, or two Gods ; or, with *Neſto-* " *rius*, into two Perſons : Though you ſhun " the words of *two Perſons* ; yet we find you " profeſſing all that is neceſſary for conſtituting " two Perſons : For who knows not, that, with " *one* Father, there is *one Perſon* of an Adopt- " ed Son, and *another Perſon* of a Proper Son ? " Nor can any Father, according to what is " known among Men, *adopt* unto himſelf his " *Proper* Son, as if he had been an *Alien* ; be- " cauſe it is of ſome Alien that Adoption is " made."

4. An *Adoptive* Sonſhip is inconſiſtent with the proper *Glory* of Jeſus Chriſt. As Adoption neceſſarily ſuppoſes a previous Alienation or Eſtrangement of the Perſon adopted, in having belonged to another Father and Family ; ſo, in the eſſential nature of the thing, it is a matter of mere *grace* or *favour*, — ſuch as cannot be any way purchaſed or deſerved : and the Lord Chriſt could not become the Object of an unpurchaſed or undeſerved Privilege. At the ſame time, — for him who is a *Proper* Son to be taken down into the ſtate of an *Adopted* Son, cannot but import a degrading of him in reſpect of Sonſhip.

The Socinian *Schlictingius*, (as quoted by Dr *Owen* on Heb. i. 6.), while he denied the *Eternal* Sonſhip of Chriſt, aſcribed another or *Adoptive* Sonſhip to him : " Chriſt" (ſaid he) " is

" not ſo the Son of God, but that others alſo " are contained in the ſame kind of Sonſhip; al- " though much inferior to Chriſt, in the perfec- " tion and degree of Sonſhip." And Dr *Owen* argues againſt him, to the following purpoſe, *viz.* " The only way of *Filiation*, the only kind " of *Sonſhip*, that Believers ſhare in, is that of " Adoption; in any other kind of Sonſhip, they " are not partakers. Now if Chriſt be the Son " of God in this kind, he muſt of neceſſity, an- " tecedently unto his adoption, be a member of " another Family; that is, of the Family of Sa- " tan and the World, as we are by Nature: And " from thence be tranſplanted, by *Adoption*, in- " to the Family of God; which is blaſphemy to " imagine. So that neither can Believers be the " Sons of God with that kind of Sonſhip which " is proper to Chriſt, he being the *Only-begotten* " of the Father: Nor can the Lord Chriſt be " the Son of God with the ſame kind of Son- " ſhip as Believers are; which is only by adop- " tion, and their tranſlation out of one Family " into another. So that either to *exalt* Belie- " vers into the ſame kind of Sonſhip with Chriſt, " or to *depreſs* him into the ſame rank with " them, is wholly inconſiſtent with the Analogy " of Faith and Principles of the Goſpel."

5. The Doctrine of an *Adoptive*, or *Second* Sonſhip, is of very pernicious conſequence with regard to the *Eternal Sonſhip* of Jeſus Chriſt.

—— This

—— This Doctrine is indeed of a ſeeming, tho' deluſive Advantage. For when one, in contending for the Truth of the neceſſary Eternal Sonſhip, finds it objected, — That the Son is often repreſented in Scripture as *inferior* to the Father, which he cannot be in reſpect of that Eternal Sonſhip; the Doctrine of a *Second* Sonſhip may then appear to be help at hand for getting over the Difficulty, or getting out of Embarraſſment by the Objection. One may imagine that he has got quite clear of it, unto a full ſtopping of his Adverſary's mouth; by telling, that, where-ever the Son is ſpoken of as *inferior* to the Father, he is ſpoken of as Mediator: and that when the Character of *Son* is applied to him as Mediator, it is not to be underſtood of his *Eternal*, — but of *another* Sonſhip.

It is needleſs to inſiſt here, upon the Vanity of the Diſtinction thus applied; that Chriſt is ſometimes ſpoken of as the Second Perſon of the Holy Trinity, the Father's equal, — and at other times as Mediator: while it is not warrantable for us to conſider him in any place of all the Bible, without conſidering him *as ſtill the ſame glorious Perſon who was ſet forth in the firſt Promiſe.*

But it is to be particularly obſerved, that the *Second* Sonſhip is not refuſed to have been *from all Eternity*; and cannot be refuſed, if Chriſt's Mediatory capacity in the original conſtitution of

the New Covenant was from everlaſting: Yea it is expreſsly taught, that "he was in Eternity "conſtituted the Firſt-born;" this Character of *Firſt-born* being repreſented, as denoting the *Second* Sonſhip. There is therefore no difference ſuppoſed betwixt the *Firſt* and *Second* Sonſhips, as to the being of both from all Eternity; only that the firſt was of *Natural Neceſſity*, — and the ſecond *free*, "altogether dependent on Will or "Choice." But when the *Second* is thus allowed to be, in ſome ſenſe, an *Eternal Sonſhip*; while there is not a Syllable in all the Bible, for diſtinguiſhing betwixt a *Free* and a *Neceſſary* Eternal Sonſhip: An Adverſary of the TRUE *Eternal Sonſhip* has no more ado, for repelling every Argument for it from every Text in all the Bible, but to ſay, — that the Text is to be underſtood of the *Second* Sonſhip only; and, upon the ſuppoſed *Eternity* of that Second Sonſhip, it is impoſſible to make any rational Defence againſt him. Particularly, if *any* of the precious Texts about the *Son* in the fifth chapter of *John* (ALL which run in an inviolable connection, concerning the ſame *one* Son in the ſame *one* Sonſhip) be given up to the Adverſary; all the reſt muſt be given up of courſe: And it would be perfectly idle, to inſiſt upon any others in all the Bible againſt him.——The diſmal conſequence then is; that, by the Doctrine of a *twofold Sonſhip*, the whole cauſe of

of the *one* true *Eternal Sonſhip* of Jeſus Chriſt is unwittingly betrayed into the Adverſary's hand.

It is far from being ſuppoſed, that any, in our Time, who have ſtumbled into the Doctrine of the *twofold Sonſhip*, — do entertain it upon ſuch a Principle and for ſuch a Purpoſe as was charged upon the two ancient Adoptionarians, *Felix* and *Elipandus*. But Error is, in its Nature, venomous and progreſſive: and though the firſt Appearance of it may be faint and harmleſs; yet, if it paſs uncontrolled, who can anſwer for the Iſſue? —— Perhaps ſome other occaſional and inconſiderate Hints may have been formerly dropped to this purpoſe, beſide what has been obſerved, concerning a valuable Divine. However, a formal teaching and maintaining of the twofold Sonſhip is a *very new Thing*: Nor could this Doctrine be given out, except upon a very raſh and injurious preſumption, — as having a place among the Principles of any Chriſtian Society. But it is expedient, for the future Purity and Peace of the Church, to have ſuch a Plant nipped in the bud; without ſuffering it to grow up unto a dangerous Maturity.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT*.

THERE has been a deal of Confuſion and Blundering, — in proſecuting a Diſtinction betwixt what belongs to him *who is* Mediator, and what belongs to him *as he is* Mediator. If we would not run into endleſs Confuſion of Thought on this Subject, which is to be thought of with Fear; we ſhould maintain a proper Diſtinction betwixt any Thing belonging to Chriſt *as* Mediator, and belonging to him *becauſe* Mediator: and then, the former Diſtinction muſt go for nothing. The Scriptures contain no aſcribing to him of *Sonſhip*, more than of Godhead, *becauſe* Mediator; but they aſcribe both to him *as* Mediator. —— What can the Word [*as*] denote in this caſe, if it ſerve for any diſtinctneſs of conception at all? It can only denote ſuch a manner of viewing him, in his Godhead and Sonſhip, as takes in the con-

* This *Poſtſcript* is an Amplification of a *Note* on the aforementioned Sermon, p. 40, 41. —— It is a great pity, that a well meant Oppoſition to ſome Doctrine of the ſaid *Note* (from a miſapprehenſion of its granting too much to the Author of the new Hereſy), ſhould have been carried the length of ſtumbling into the old Pit of a *twofold Sonſhip*.

ſideration

ſideration of his Mediatory Character, — of his being God the Son in that gracious Office: And, when taking any view of him at all, can we juſtly put out or lay aſide that Conſideration?

As God is an Object of *Natural Knowledge*, — in the works of Creation and Providence, with the dictates of Reaſon and Conſcience; all which are glorioufly illuſtrated by the Scriptures; — he is alſo an Object of *Supernatural Knowledge*, in the Revelation which he has made of himſelf by the Goſpel: or, he is ſet forth as both the God of *Nature* — and a God of *Grace* to Sinners; which Characters, as of no neceſſary Connection, admit of being ſeparately conſidered. For, though we cannot rightly view him as the God of *Grace*, without taking in a conſideration of his being the God of *Nature* who has become ſuch: yet a viewing of him as the God of *Nature*, doth not neceſſarily import or take in a conſideration of him as alſo the God of *Grace*; becauſe there is no inſeparable connection of theſe characters. At the ſame time, our acknowledgement of him in each of theſe Characters — ſhould be proportioned to the whole extent of each. In any view of him as an Object of Natural Knowledge, we muſt not exclude or lay aſide the conſideration of any of his *Natural* Attributes; we ſhould ſtill eſſay to acknowledge him as one God of Nature in all theſe: and in any view

view of him as an Object of Supernatural Knowledge, we muſt not exclude or lay aſide the conſideration of any of his *gracious* Characters; we ſhould alſo ſtill eſſay to acknowledge him as one God of Grace in them all.

But there is no room for any ſuch Diſtinctions concerning Jeſus Chriſt, becauſe he is altogether an Object of *Supernatural Knowledge*; no apprehenſion whatſoever is to be had of him, but from the Goſpel Revelation and Teſtimony concerning him: ſo that all his Characters muſt be of one complex, indiviſible conſideration. It is unqueſtionable, that the original Revelation of him, in the firſt Promiſe, — did exhibit him to our firſt Parents, *as* a wonderful Mediator betwixt God and Man; and the Revelation of him was never afterwards put upon a different footing: Every thing concerning him, from the 15th verſe of the third chapter of *Geneſis* to the laſt verſe of the *Revelation*, all incluſive, — was juſt an amplification of the firſt Promiſe; and ſo, belongs all to the Revelation made of him as Mediator. We have no Revelation of any thing belonging to him *who is* Mediator, but in the Revelation which is made of him *as* Mediator: while it is altogether from the glorious device, and for the gracious purpoſes of his Mediation, — that any Revelation has been made at all to ſinful Men. The Scripture reveals him as being the only true God, the ſame one God with the

the Father; and it reveals him as being the Eternal Son of God, the Father's equal: His Character of Sonſhip being ſuppoſed unto, but having no dependence on his Mediatory State; while that Character is wholly of natural neceſſity, and this State is wholly of free Grace. But ſtill, with regard to all the Revelation which is made of him as God, and as the Eternal Son of God; this is altogether incorporated with the Revelation which is made of him as Mediator: ſo that we cannot warrantably divide or ſeparate theſe Myſteries; we cannot rightly take him up in any place of Scripture, as ſpoken of or to be conſidered without reſpect to his Mediatory Character,—while it is ſtill the glorious Mediator who is ſpoken of.

Various Works are indeed aſcribed to him in Scripture, which do not belong to his *Mediation*; as in the glorious Characters of his being the Creator of all Things, in whom all Things conſiſt, upholding all Things by the Word of his Power. But who is the Perſon concerning whom ſuch things are affirmed? It is the Perſon of the Mediator; to be conſidered as our Mediator, under theſe glorious Characters. He is JEHOVAH, the LORD; but to be conſidered as *the* LORD *our Righteouſneſs*: He is *God*, the *Moſt High God*; but to be conſidered as IMMANUEL, *God with us*: He is a *Son*, the Eternal Son of God, by neceſſary Generation; but to be conſidered as

a Son given unto us : — Still, in all his Characters, he is to be conſidered as Mediator.

It would certainly ſound ill in Chriſtian Ears, — to diſtinguiſh betwixt Attributes belonging to him *who is* God, and Attributes belonging to him *as* God; while every Attribute that belongs to him in the former reſpect, belongs to him in the latter alſo. And it ſhould not ſound well in Chriſtian Ears, — to diſtinguiſh what belongs to him *who is* Mediator, from what belongs to him *as* Mediator; thereby diſtinguiſhing this glorious One into *ſeparable* Characters : For if we take not *all* about him along with *every Thing* about him, without ſeparating any of his Characters in our conſideration of him; we are upon the matter dividing the One Chriſt, the One God-man Mediator.

We may well enough talk in the way of ſuch diſtinctions about Creatures, about Men; becauſe they have various Characters which are (not only diſtinct, but) really ſeparable, — each not implying, or inſeparably connected with all the reſt. There is no Impropriety, — in diſtinguiſhing betwixt what belongs to him *who is* a Man, and what belongs to him *as* a Man; or what belongs to him *who is* a Magiſtrate, and what belongs to him *as* a Magiſtrate : Becauſe various Things really belong to the Man, to the Magiſtrate, — which do not belong to the one or the other as ſuch; there being but a mere occaſional connection

tion of theſe things, in their different Characters. We may therefore talk after this manner about Creatures, without any indignity thereby done to them. But we cannot talk after this manner about the *One Mediator*, more than about the *One God*, — without ſome obſcuring of the Mediator's infinite Glory; the Glory of thoſe Characters in which he is revealed, — as ſo inſeparable in his Perſon, that each implies and preſents all to the Faith of Chriſtians.

It is therefore a very improper and raw way of ſpeaking, however well intended; to tell us, that, in one place, Chriſt is ſpoken of only as the Second Perſon of the Holy Trinity, — and that, in another place, he is ſpoken of only as Mediator: As if theſe, while *diſtinct*, were alſo *ſeparable* Characters in his Perſon; yea actually ſeparated. No genuine Chriſtian will refuſe, that he is *All-ſufficient* as Mediator: But how can this be, — if he is not God, and the Eternal Son of God, as Mediator; ſo as there can be no ſeparation of any of theſe Characters, either from his Perſon or from one another? The Mediator, as ſuch, is God the Second Perſon of the Trinity; and God the Second Perſon of the Trinity, as ſuch in Human Nature, is the Mediator. He would indeed have for ever ſubſiſted in that Divine Perſonality, though he had never been a Mediator; yet, when graciouſly inveſted with this Office, — he ought not to be upon the matter diveſted of it, in our abſtract-

ing

ing or metaphyſical conſiderations of him. His *Eternal Sonſhip*, and his *Supreme Godhead* IN *that Sonſhip*, can be brought into no place among the Objects of *Natural Knowledge*; ſo as they might be conſidered ſeparately from, or in the way of excluding or laying aſide the view of his Mediatory Character. He is altogether an Object of Faith: And it is inconſiſtent with the Nature of Faith, to divide or deal partially with its Object; it muſt always take up a *whole* Chriſt, or no Chriſt at all.

He is the *Moſt High God*, as Mediator; and he is the *Eternal Son of God*, as Mediator: The unſearchable Myſtery of his *Official Inferiority* to the Father, being no more inconſiſtent with the one than with the other; ſo that there can be no Occaſion, for ſolving Difficulties about this matter, to bring in the noxious device of a *Second* or *Adoptive* Sonſhip, — more than of a Second or inferior Godhead, which none are yet left to imagine.

FINIS.

18 AP 68